



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

## THE CHAIRMAN'S ADDRESS

DELIVERED ON WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 27, 1916, AT CHICAGO, ILLINOIS, AT THE TWENTY-SECOND ANNUAL MEETING OF THE CENTRAL DIVISION OF THE MODERN LANGUAGE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA

BY WILLIAM HENRY HULME

---

SCHOLARSHIP AS A BOND OF INTERNATIONAL UNION

---

If I had to choose a "text" which should best set forth my theme, it would be the following passage from the third book of *Paradise Regained*:

They err, who count it glorious to subdue  
By conquest far and wide, to overrun  
Large countries, and in fields great battles win,  
Great cities by assault: what do these worthies,  
But rob and spoil, burn, slaughter, and enslave  
Peaceable nations, neighboring or remote,  
Made captive, yet deserving freedom more  
Than those their conquerors, who leave behind  
Nothing but ruin wheresoe'er they rove,  
And all the flourishing works of peace destroy;  
Then swell with pride, and must be titled gods,  
Great benefactors of mankind, deliverers,  
Worshipp'd with temple, priest, and sacrifice!  
One is the son of Jove, of Mars the other;  
Till conqueror Death discover them scarce men,  
Rolling in brutish vices and deform'd,  
Violent or shameful death their due reward.  
But if there be in glory aught of good,  
It may by means far different be attain'd,  
Without ambition, war, or violence;  
By deeds of peace, by wisdom eminent,  
By patience, temperance.

While I am concerned this evening especially with the sentiment contained in the last half dozen lines of this remarkable passage, written more than two centuries ago by one of the great poets of England and the world, the thought of the whole applies with striking fitness to the situation as it has existed in Europe for more than two years. How clearly Milton here sets forth the uselessness and wickedness of war, and suggests the ease and simplicity by which nations might settle all their quarrels and strife,

By deeds of peace, by wisdom eminent,  
By patience, temperance.

The events of recent years show with peculiar force how fickle and fragile the ties of friendship are which bind nation to nation; how much national friendships and the peace of the world are contingent on the whims, ignorance, and wickedness of designing politicians and diplomats; how easy it is for men otherwise noble and honorable to lose their world-perspective and all sense of justice and righteousness in the face of merely national and local crises; how difficult it is under the restrictions of national and patriotic obligations, for any question of general or universal moral significance that transcends the narrow and fast limits of purely national interests to receive an impartial hearing from the best and most considerate leaders of public opinion. One of the worst effects of this most horrible of all wars is the degradation and debasement which public opinion is suffering under ruthless military oppression. I mean to say, that those leaders of society who would everywhere if they could give voice to the noblest sentiments and finest feelings of the different belligerent nations are so muzzled and gagged and blind-folded and dazed mentally and spiritually by soulless military methods, that either they do not know what to think,

or they dare not give public expression to their real opinions. For supposed or assumed reasons of military expediency, the press is censored beyond all possibility of recognition; newspapers and other publications of one belligerent nation are not allowed to circulate in another,—or only in a censored and garbled form. The people of one country are thus not only ignorant of the real conditions, sentiments, and feelings of another people with whom they happen through no fault of their own to be at war, but they are often led by means of vicious governmental politics to believe what is the exact opposite of the truth, and to give their support to policies which are subversive of every principle of human justice and virtue.

Under normal conditions, in well ordained, civilized society the strongest men in intellect and personality become leaders; they mould and direct the thoughts, opinions, and feelings of the masses, and they are honored and respected for their ability and power. But under military despotisms, such as those which at present control the destinies of the great nations of Europe, there is no longer any independence of mind and spirit, except insofar as it is subservient to the needs of barbarous war and held in check by them. Men with the brightest minds, greatest culture, and highest scholarly attainments have been virtually reduced to the ranks of the non-thinking multitude. Writers and speakers who dare express opinions which, however true and just they may be in the eyes of the world, criticise in any way the actions of military governments and leaders, though these may tend to destroy the very foundations of righteousness and justice, are made to suffer the extreme penalties of martial law. And yet these noble men and women are wholly sincere and honest in what they think and say and write. They are not morally more perverted and reprehensible now than they were

before the war, when their opinions and words received the respect and admiration of the world, tho their conclusions are less worthy of consideration. In a certain sense, they must of course eventually suffer greatly and lose prestige in the oppressive atmosphere of the narrow intellectual and spiritual prison which an unnecessarily severe military censorship has built up around them. The mind usually grows weak and diseased if forced to lie idle, just as does a sound arm long worn in a sling; or if it is compelled to perform its functions under unnatural and constantly restrained conditions, it is sure to become warped and illiberal. Its processes must be free and unobstructed, if its conclusions are to command respectful admiration and be authoritative.

War then—and the present one particularly—strikes the severest blow at the very foundations of true scholarship, not only by destroying the most suitable and promising materials for its future development, but also by limiting and discouraging its devotees in the proper exercise of their essential rights and inherent privileges. It is therefore our duty in a special sense to uphold with all our energies the dignities and privileges of scholarship everywhere in the world, and to condemn on every occasion any attempt to undermine and destroy its power and influence. For scholarship has always been peaceable and peace-loving. The growth of scholarly methods of thought and investigation, and the increase of scholarly incentives and ideals, form the most promising basis for lasting universal peace.

Recent events show that few considerations in the realm of diplomacy and international law except selfish interests have any influence in determining the relations that may exist at any time among the governments of nations. So long as this state of affairs continues, there can be

little hope of any lasting peace in the world. And such conditions will probably continue to control the fate of nations in the future, until some more human and ideal basis of international friendships is discovered. International conferences, national leagues of peace, and arbitration courts, are, to be sure, not without value as means for attaining the much desired end; for they by their constant agitations keep the minds of the people fixed upon the goal. But so far the splendid theoretical structures erected for furthering the cause of universal peace and brotherhood have all collapsed under the least pressure of national selfishness, as easily as the child's toy house of cards falls at the slightest touch of its small hand.

According to a recent political writer:

Admirable and far-sighted plans for securing a peaceful international order have been before the world for 300 years. M. Emeric Crucé submitted his plan, which included liberty of commerce throughout all the world, as early as 1623. Following the peace of Utrecht, the Abbé de St. Pierre developed his plan, which included mediation, arbitration, and an interesting addition to the effect that any sovereign who took up arms before the union of nations had declared war, or who refused to execute a regulation of the Union or a judgment of the Senate, was to be declared an enemy of European society. The Union was then to make war upon him until he should be disarmed or until the regulation or judgment should be executed. Some twenty years earlier William Penn had produced his quaint and really extraordinary plan for the peace of Europe, in which he, too, proposed to proceed by military power against any sovereign who refused to submit his claims to a proposed diet, or parliament, of Europe, or who refused to abide by and to perform any judgment of such a body. All these plans, like those of Rousseau, Bentham, and Kant, which came later, as well as William Ladd's elaborate and carefully considered essay on a Congress of Nations, published in 1840, were brought into the world too soon. They were the fine and noble dreams of seers which it is taking civilized men three centuries and more to begin effectively to realize.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> "Cosmos," in *New York Times*, December 9, 1916.

It is open to serious question whether the world is even yet ready for the formation of such a peace league as shall be of lasting, binding force. The numerous peoples of the world are still controlled too much by national considerations,—they are in fact as yet too little informed about one another's peculiar traits and qualities and rights. They need to be brought into more intimate relations of mutual friendship and comity than heretofore. They must be better informed and instructed about international problems of all kinds. Above everything else, the people of one nation must be brought to understand that their own right to exist ceases to be a right, nationally speaking, if that means the breaking down of the rights and traditions of other nations with equal or similar privileges. In other words, they must come to believe and feel that conquests of territory for purposes of national expansion which violate the inherent rights of other independent, civilized nations, belong to the Dark Ages of the past and can no longer be tolerated. We are, I hope, gradually reaching that stage in the process of national development when we shall no longer feel it to be the all important thing for our children to be narrowly patriotic. They should become, even if we have not become, citizens of the world in the true sense. They should early be taught to think and feel that all civilized nations are composed of *human* beings who have as much right to life and happiness on earth as they themselves. The world is so large and the opportunities for individual and national growth are so infinite in variety, that the surplus population of every over-crowded nation should find ample room in it for expansion, not as colonies of the mother-country, but as integral parts of whatever national organization they happen for reasons of advantage and convenience to become identified with.

There would, indeed, seem to be no really practical basis—a basis determined by mutual arrangements in the field of practical politics and diplomacy—for the development and stabilizing of the theories of most ardent peace advocates, because of the fact perhaps that the principles which favor the national development of one country may be, and frequently are, most potent elements of national decadence in another. The wisest statesmen and diplomats often find themselves powerless, however much it may seem wise and good, internationally speaking, to resist the evident demands of national well-being, and to meet half way proposals of other nations looking toward the establishment of international comity. Tariff and customs laws often add to the prosperity of one nation and to the poverty of another; immigration regulations are frequently highly advantageous to one nation, whereas the same laws may be oppressive and unjust to another; the currency laws which are particularly suited to a country rich in mineral wealth, would be unendurable in one poor in mineral resources. A country with an extensive seaboard and numerous fine harbors must evidently have a different system of shipping regulations from one which is almost or wholly cut off from such facilities; and a country that is thickly populated and prosperous in various manufacturing industries, must certainly have not only a different code of domestic laws from that of a sparsely settled agricultural country, but also different kinds of laws and regulations for the successful guidance of its external relations. Especially are the religious and social customs and traditions of would-be friendly nations often so diametrically opposed, as to make harmonious relations between any two of them almost a matter of impossibility.

Many of these and other national characteristics and differences are, however, frequently emphasized unneces-

sarily; and national self-interests are almost always exaggerated by the statesmen and diplomats who have them in their keeping. Numerous conciliatory compromises and unselfish adjustments might be made by one nation for the good of another and of the world, without any material loss to itself. But so long as national spirit, patriotism, and loyalty to one's own country are placed above all other human interests and considerations, the most energetic efforts for lasting peace in the world will be of little avail. The standards of national morality must be raised to a loftier plane than they have hitherto reached. Individuals and nations must be brought to see that the welfare of the whole world frequently requires much national self-denial and sacrifice. They must, in fact, be made to realize that patriotism—love of mother country—is not necessarily the highest civic and religious virtue. There occasionally come times in the history of nations when the love and the welfare of humanity are to be placed far above the love of country,—especially if the interests of country, national interests, are clearly opposed to the interests of humanity. We need most of all an instructed, enlightened public opinion in the international, as well as the national sense. And until a strong public opinion and an abiding sense of the moral responsibility of nations to the demands of universal welfare have become dominant elements in all national political and social systems, the threatening cloud of war will continue to lower in the clear sky of peace.

But how can this national, that is, international public opinion best be fostered and most consistently and rapidly developed? There evidently is now and always has been something radically wrong with all national methods of creating and instructing a public opinion of the highest character. The press is, perhaps, or might easily become

the most practicable and powerful instrument in the processes of international education. The press, however, will itself have first to be educated away from the peculiarly narrow national standards and ideals which it has so far usually followed and glorified, before it can become a real leader of this world-wide propaganda of the future. We must, indeed, have a daily press that shall create and form public opinion, rather than one which follows blindly every wave of popular opinion and sentiment. In the opinion of lovers of peace and opponents of war in this country, the continuous warnings in the daily and other papers about the necessity of national preparedness and the possibility of attacks in the future from better equipped and more efficient foes—to mention just one point—are certainly not contributory to a genuine sentiment of peace and good-will in the world,—they should indeed be felt to be contradictory of the essential principles of the truest, most modern civilization. How far, one is constantly asking oneself, as one reads the most prominent headlines in the daily papers about the importance of strengthening our national defenses and adopting the newest weapons in our army and navy, have we of the twentieth century advanced beyond the barbaric standards of medieval robber barons, if we must constantly be armed to the teeth and always have more and better weapons than every other nation which may possibly make war on us in the dim future? Is efficiency in war-like preparation and in ruthless and destructive methods of waging war really going to be the measure of the highest civilization in the coming generations?

The next most effective means for producing the necessary international public opinion of the future should be primary and secondary education. But here again too much emphasis is apt to be laid upon the inculcation in

our schools of narrow national ideas of patriotism. The ideals of the schools in this respect must be essentially modified, so that our boys and girls may have impressed upon their minds not merely *patriotic* sentiments, but the higher conception that all nations are brothers (or sisters) of one great human family. It is in institutions for the encouragement and promotion of higher education, no matter where they are located, that we usually find the liveliest centres for the distribution of cosmopolitan ideas, and accordingly for the instruction of public opinion along international lines. International unity, a cosmopolitan interest in humanity, and some form of universal brotherhood constitute a goal toward which all nations of the world should tend in the future, even with the slightest prospects of attaining it, the

one far-off divine event,  
To which the whole creation moves.

Now, the spread of knowledge, the scattering of the dark clouds of ignorance and superstition, the growth among nations of high and higher educational standards and ideals, seem to point out one of the easiest roads to the goal in question. The basis of scholarly attainment along any line must be a generous supply of good educational facilities, which may be entirely, or largely, practical and national. But true scholarship, the finest flower of all educational preparation, is perhaps the least national, the least selfish, and the most humane of all vocations. Its main concern is the search for and discovery of truth; and truth knows no selfish or national barriers and restrictions. True scholars have since the Dark Ages been allowed by universal consent to transcend all barriers, break down all traditions, and sever all bonds, in their attempts to gain this most precious treasure of the world

of mind and spirit. National distinctions and individual peculiarities have vanished before their studies and researches like mountain mists before the warming, drying rays of the bright sun.

There were undoubtedly scholars and scholarship in the world long before the dawn of the Renaissance. But in those earlier days learning was confined to the favored few and limited to a narrow range of subjects. It was the occupation of cloistered monks in leisure hours, and was probably taken up in most cases to while away the tedium and idleness of monastic life. The vocation of the priest and his limited library and laboratory facilities made it necessary for him to confine his studies mainly to theology and philosophy. There was no incentive to the study of language and literature, and dabbling in science was usually under the ban of the Church. After the passing of ancient Rome, about all the learning of the times was kept in the Church, and for many centuries of medieval Christianity the schools were almost entirely under the control of the Church, which took good care that its youth learned little about things of purely secular interest. Zeal for scholarship as such was unknown. About all the truth that could be known was perverted theological truth. Truth was then not beauty, nor was beauty allowed to be truth or a joy forever. And the Church was unwilling that the truth should make the people free. Though the language of the Church was Greek in the East and Latin in the West, the study of classical literature was forbidden, because of the fear that knowledge of their beauty might demoralize by its purely secular and pagan character.

Yet there was in spite of all this, more of world unity of a certain kind in those early years of Christianity than there has ever been since. For Christianity, which was

in the second five hundred years of its existence the most powerful force in medieval civilization, was mainly unified in spirit; and the different Christian nations of the world spoke and wrote for the most part a common language. And a common religious faith and a common language are among the most potent factors of national or international unity. Moreover, national rivalry and jealousy had not yet arisen, or were in their infancy. Light always means growth in the spiritual and intellectual world, as well as in that of organic life. And growth brings conscious strength, which is in turn followed by the desire to exercise that strength. Little by little the desire for knowledge and the love of truth penetrated the souls of a few of the more highly favored individuals of the later Middle Ages, until the bonds of the Church and the unity of religious interests were no longer strong enough to keep them confined. Meanwhile, tribes and nations began to be differentiated in various ways from one another, and to become conscious national entities. Vernacular languages gradually usurped the place and most of the functions of the common language of Christianity. These differentiations were accompanied by the strengthening of the ties of nationality and patriotism, frequently at the cost of loyalty and devotion to the common mother Church.

So modern scholarship had its origin at a momentous time in the history of the world. The three hundred years from 1300 to 1600 witnessed the passing of the old and the coming of the new in Church and state. The literatures of Greece and Rome were revived, and those of some half-dozen modern nations developed to a pitch of art and power only a little inferior, if any, to the best of the ancient classics. But the life-giving power of every one of these modern literatures was drawn in the main from classical sources. And what a wonderful world of

human and spiritual relationships was opened up by the rediscovery of the long hidden and virtually forgotten literature of Greece and Rome! When Italians and French and English and Germans were first permitted through the scholarly activities of the humanistic movement to become familiar with the beautiful and inspiring thoughts of the ancient Greek and Roman poets, the effect upon the life of those peoples was immediate. Their leading thinkers and teachers were soon lifted out of their traditional surroundings and methods of thought and feeling by discovering that other nations in former ages had worshipped exquisite conceptions of beauty and lofty ideals of character. In the epics of Homer and Virgil and the dramas of Euripides and Terence they found the thrilling inspiration of beautiful thoughts, beautiful language, and noble characters. Greek and Roman philosophy suggested to those eager students of the new old literatures the possibility of real human justice, human sympathy, and the brotherhood of man. The horizon of their hitherto dark world was thus brightened and broadened, the intensity of their feelings deepened and strengthened, and their conceptions of justice and mercy were gradually elevated to a higher realm of human emotions.

Throughout the period of the Middle Ages, human brotherhood and international comity and comradeship in the modern sense were virtually unknown. It was on the whole an age of intense selfishness and brutality, even among so-called Christian peoples. To the rude and vigorous nations of that period the idea of contest and conquest seems to have been all-important. They were almost continually at war and gloried in it. The years of peace that came occasionally were looked upon mainly as times favorable to prepare for war. War and carnage, destruction of human life and property, were in most

cases undertaken and practised as an end in themselves. There was little or no regard for man as an individual. The value of individual character and individual responsibility was not appreciated. Man as man was nothing but a very small and unnecessary cog in one of the numerous insignificant wheels of the rather complex machine of medieval civilization.

But in the very dawn of the Renaissance emphasis began to be laid more on the really human elements in the lives of nations and individuals. The hard intellectuality of medieval scholasticism was gradually softened by the revival of language and literary studies. Schools were rapidly multiplied and radical changes made in their curricula. The tyranny and corruption of the Church became unbearable as the light of the new learning began to flash upon the souls of men. Literature became immensely more interesting because of the growing intensity of its genuine human qualities. The conventional, soulless medieval allegories were bit by bit filled to the bursting point with the energy and exuberance of human spirits. Poets like Boccaccio and Chaucer showed a knowledge of and sympathy with man hitherto unheard of. Nothing in English or any other literature previous to Shakespeare is so full of purely human interest as the *Canterbury Tales*, and was at the same time so much affected by the broad scholarship of the Italian Renaissance. The Prolog is probably the most remarkable gallery of splendid human portraits, sympathetically drawn from life, that the literatures of the world contain. It introduces to the reader men and women from about every class of the complex society of England in the fourteenth century. But Chaucer without the stimulus and inspiration of French and Italian learning and literary models would have been an impossibility. The variety of his poetical forms and

subjects, the wealth of illustrative materials, the beauty of his diction and imagery and language and style came mostly from French and Italian sources. His philosophy of life too was largely colored and determined by the *Romaunt of the Rose* and Boethius. When Chaucer makes the Clerk of Oxford

telle a tale which that I  
Lerned at Padowe of a worthy clerk,  
As preved by his wordes and his werk.  
He is now deed and nayled in his cheste,  
I prey to god so yeve his soule reste!  
Fraunceys Petrark, the laureate poete,  
Highte this clerk, whos rethoryke sweete  
Enlumined al Itaille of poetrye,

we have, says Legouis, "the first ray of the Renaissance lighting upon an English imagination." The first great poet of English literature, therefore, owes his greatness largely to the fact that literature and learning were becoming in his day in a measure cosmopolitan.

From Chaucer to Shakespeare learning in Europe took long and rapid strides. And the wealth of inspiring subjects and illustrative materials, resulting entirely from the revival of learning, which was open to the poets of England at the close of the sixteenth century, as compared with the paucity of these intellectual and spiritual stimuli in the beginning of the fourteenth century, is truly astounding. During these three hundred years the English people emerged from a state of isolated semi-barbarism to one of almost cosmopolitan enlightenment. The spread of classical learning, the development of printing, and the growth of religious reform were the main instruments in this wonderful transformation. I speak of English conditions, particularly, because I know more about them than about those of the other great European nations, and because England, though the last of them to feel and en-

joy the full force of the humanistic movement, accepted its teachings—literary, political, and ethical—more entirely perhaps than any other nation. It may also be said with truth, I think, that fewer distinctly medieval characteristics lingered on in the political and social system of England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries than in that of any nation of Europe. If, indeed, the changes wrought by the Renaissance in Italy, France, and Germany had been as deep and far-reaching as they were in England, might not the modern world probably have been spared the devastating horrors of most of its great wars?

While humanism was not altogether responsible for the growth of democracy and liberalism in the politics of England, its influence was certainly strongly felt along all lines of intellectual and spiritual development. From the mid-years of the seventeenth century on, in England and among Continental peoples, there are definite indications that scholarship counted for more in shaping the destinies of nations than it ever had counted before. Government officials whose duty it was to look after foreign relations were occasionally, as in the case of John Milton, among the greatest scholars of their time. It was, moreover, in these years that the tradition arose in England which required every gentleman to be in the broadest sense a scholar and to spend considerable time in travelling and study on the Continent in order to complete and round out his education. Thus the men who were to be the leaders in national affairs were given opportunities for familiarizing themselves with the peculiarities of Continental society and governments, and coming to a juster, more humane appreciation of social and political principles and institutions very different from their own.

It is, indeed, this tendency of modern scholarly pursuits to take men out of themselves, out of the narrow social circles in which they would otherwise continually move, that we may find the greatest benefits to mankind. Ignorance and superstition and prejudice have always been the main sources of the error and evil and misery of the world. But these qualities disappear, vanish, before the light of learning. The scholarly attitude of mind demands a careful consideration of all the obtainable facts bearing on any particular point before a just conclusion may be reached. And this attitude of mind has no doubt in many cases played a great part in the development of the modern system of international relationships. Nations, as individuals, usually find each other agreeable or disagreeable according as they know more or less about each other's character and personality, strength and weakness. Education not only "*forms* the common mind," but it broadens, expands the range of human sympathy. The more our hearts and minds and sympathies are enlarged, the less narrowly national and patriotic and selfish we become.

In a practical way, scholarship has performed wonders in the matter of drawing nations closer together during the last one hundred years. The studies of history, philology, philosophy, and science have in that time all ceased to be national—have become international. How much have history and philology done, working along ethnical, anthropological lines, to familiarize people everywhere with the close kinship of nations in language, laws, political and social institutions, as well as in racial qualities, character, and temperament! And the sciences of biology and geology have revealed the marvelous unity and harmony that exist among all the creatures and objects of animate and inanimate nature. The names of

many of the famous scholars of the past have become in the international sense household words. The Grimm brothers not only created the science of comparative grammar, but they opened up a great new world of folk-lore and fable, in which millions and millions of children from every part of the story-loving universe have dreamed and reveled for almost a century and will continue to do so to the end of time. The study of ancient and medieval mythology from the comparative point of view has under the guidance of such scholars as Müllenhoff, Meyer, and Bugge laid students in every part of the world under the greatest obligations. The debt of the world to the epoch-making discoveries in the field of science which Charles Darwin made and described is incalculable. The names and fame of those inspiring teachers and eminent scholars Paul Meyer and Gaston Paris have reached and helped students of medieval literature in every corner of the globe.

But these are only a few of the names of our greatest scholars, whose work has done so much toward binding the minds and hearts of the nations together into what in the future will prove to be an indissoluble union. The noble work is still going on. But it progresses slowly and silently for the most part. The number of true scholars is steadily increasing from year to year. A larger and larger proportion of the people of civilized nations is all the time coming under the formative and determining power of scholarly influences. And it is not alone the great scholars in the strict sense who have worked, probably in most cases unconsciously, towards the bringing about of universal lasting peace. Really great men in every walk of life, who are often scholars by nature, especially great poets and artists,—all men indeed who have “dipped into the future far as human eye could see,” have

had visions of "all the wonder that would be." Dante and Shakespeare and Milton and Goethe, two of whom at least were great scholars as well as great poets, were all international rather than national in outlook and in the general tone of their best, most permanent work. The noblest poetry each of them wrote is that which makes the broadest, most universal appeal. Indeed, the greatest poetry, the finest art, and the deepest science, could hardly be simply national. Goethe says in one of his inimitable bits of conversation, that science and art belong to the world, and that all national barriers must vanish before their onward march—"denn Wissenschaft und Kunst gehören der Welt an, und vor ihnen verschwinden die Schranken der Nationalität."

Of all possible ways and methods of bringing the nations of the world into closer relations of friendship and mutual good will, scholarship is perhaps the least selfish in its outlook and immediate effects. The true scholar should be and usually is less affected by purely selfish considerations than individuals of any other sphere of human activities. His interests more than those of any one else are mainly in the realm of mind and spirit. His conceptions of the principles of life, character, and society have been formed for the most part by the close study of the history, languages, literatures, scientific developments, and philosophical theories of other nations of the world besides his own. He represents more nearly than any other human being the finer breath and spirit of things. His life more than that of any other is likely to be spent in closest communion with the best mental and spiritual products of all the ages. He should be and generally is less impelled to action by purely practical considerations than other people are. The practical world indeed constantly refers to the scholar in a derogatory manner, as a theo-

rיסט, an idealist. But with Emerson "I reject the abusive application of the term *practical* to the lower activities" of life. "Let us hear no more of the practical men," he says, "or I will tell you something of them—this, namely, that the scholar finds in them unlooked-for acceptance of his most paradoxical experience." The scholar is in truth the great idealist of human society; and how much the politics of the world is now in need of a few thousand great leaders who might justly be called idealists! He reads more broadly and usually thinks more deeply about the many problems that concern the highest life of man. He is less ambitious in a selfish way for rank and station in life. He is less likely to covet great riches and the life of luxury they bring. He is generally the most progressive member of society. He believes in moving on and helping the world to move on. He does not hold to the old because it is old, nor grasp at the new because of its novelty. He is always ready to "ring out the old" or "ring in the new," if he is convinced that the confines of truth will thus be extended. Jealousy and pride, both personal and national, are more usually restrained by the scholar and made to adapt themselves to the best interests of his fellowmen, than by others. "The society of lettered men," says Emerson, "is a university which does not bound itself with the walls of one cloister or college; but gathers in the distant and solitary student into its strictest amity. . . . As in coming among strange faces we find that the love of letters makes us friends, so in strange thoughts, in the worldly habits which harden us, we find with some surprise that learning and truth and beauty have not let us go; that the spiritual nature is too strong for us; that those excellent influences which men in all ages have called the *Muse*, or by some kindred name, come in to keep us warm and true."

If then the “office of the scholar is to cheer, to raise, and to guide men by showing them facts amidst appearances,” how admirably is he adapted to the great work of harmonizing the strident notes that grate on the sensitive souls of a discordant world. Scholarship and the scholar have already accomplished much in the right direction. This work of unifying moves, indeed, like the mills of the gods, but it moves just as surely. Again I say, if we look back over the past and see what has been done by students of comparative philology and literature, comparative history, and the sciences in bringing the past down to the present, in making the most remote as familiar as the most closely situated, and in establishing strong friendships among numerous of the choicest spirits of the most widely separated nations, we must feel that the magic touch of scholarship has almost succeeded in making “the whole world kin.” And many of us feel, no doubt, in spite of most discouraging prospects in many quarters of the world, that

The old order is changing, yielding place to the new  
and that

God fulfils himself in many ways,  
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.

These promising results are being obtained through a multiplicity of strong but subtly working forces. The dissemination of the printed results of scholarly work in every part of the world; the migration of special students from the universities of one country to those of another; the formation of learned societies of all kinds, to which distinguished foreign scholars are frequently elected; the establishing of international scholarships, fellowships, or other foundations, and very recently, a mutual interchange

of professors and lecturers among several of the great nations,—these are some of the means and methods by which scholarship has gradually been compassing the hoped-for fruition of world-wide comity and universal brotherhood.

But no one of these instrumentalities that are quietly bringing about international good will and banishing national prejudices, is destined to have such rich results, it seems to me, as the study of modern languages and literatures. No other studies so broaden and humanize the mind of the student, by familiarizing him with the thoughts and emotions, the hopes and ideals of the various nationalities of the world. In no other way can the student so easily and naturally be brought into sympathetic relations with foreign conceptions of government, society, and religion. The members of this and similar associations have, therefore, in their keeping to a certain extent the determination of universal peace conditions in the world of the future. We and our students and their students are and will be continually preparing the way for closer union and coöperation of the most intimate intellectual and spiritual interests of the whole world,—not by any conventional and supposedly binding laws, constitutions, and treaties, which are liable to be broken any moment by the demands of national selfishness, but by silent and almost imperceptible influences, working in the main unconsciously, but continuously and ubiquitously towards a common end and aim. If in the future it may only be possible to curb and smother the tendency evident in some quarters of recent years to violate the implied pledges of friendship between nation and nation by the insidious introduction into our scholarly relations of the political propaganda of a wholly narrow, selfish, and vicious nationalism and false patriotism, we shall indeed eventually

be able to rejoice that we have succeeded in bringing about the grand "parliament of man, the federation of the world," of which one of the great poets of England long ago dreamed. And then we can really believe and say with him

So the whole round earth is every way  
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God.

---